

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 31 are pending and rejected.

The applicant's attorney cancels claims 23, 30 and 31; adds claims 32 – 43; and amends claims 1, 13 and 24. Claims 1, 13 and 24 are amended, not to overcome the examiner's art-based rejection, but to more clearly recite an aspect of the applicant's invention. The amendments do not narrow the claims and do not add new matter. The added claims 32 – 43 correspond to claims 5, 7 – 10, 16, 18 – 21, 28 and 29, which the examiner stated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the examiner's §112 rejections. The applicant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejections against the claims, as pending before the current amendments, and asserts that claims 1 – 22, 24 – 29 and 32 – 43, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed below.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicant's attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an Office Action, the examiner call Mr. David Plettner (408-447-3013) or Mr. John Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

Examiner's assertion that claims 23, 30 and 31 include new matter

Although the applicant's attorney has canceled claims 23, 30 and 31, the applicant's attorney has not canceled these claims to overcome the examiner's assertion that each recites new matter. Claims 1, 13 and 24, as amended, more clearly recite a single circuit board including a first circuit and a second circuit, or a first circuit board including a first circuit and a second circuit board including a second circuit.

The applicant's attorney disagrees with the examiner's assertion that a single circuit board including a first circuit and a second circuit is new matter for at least two reasons. First, claim 1 as originally filed was generic to one circuit board including the first circuit and the second circuit. Second, FIG. 1, which shows an embodiment of the invention, and paragraphs 19 – 22, which discuss the embodiment shown in

FIG. 1, do not state that the second circuit must be included in a circuit board that is different from the one that includes the first circuit.

Rejection of claims 1 – 22 and 24 – 29 based the examiner's assertion of indefiniteness

The applicant's attorney respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion that claims 1 – 22 and 24 – 29, as pending before the current amendments, are indefinite. However, the applicant's attorney has amended claims 1, 13 and 24 to more clearly and more distinctly claim the subject matter of the applicant's invention.

Claims 2 – 12, 14 – 22 and 25 – 29 are patentable over the examiner's indefinite rejections at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on claims 1, 13 and 24, as pending before the current amendments and as currently amended.

Rejection against claims 1 – 12, 28 and 29 over Thrush

The applicant's attorney respectfully asserts that claim 1, as pending before the current amendment and as currently amended, is patentable over U.S. Patent 5,403,195 to Thrush *et al.* (Thrush) at least because Thrush fails to disclose a capacitor coupled to first and second contacts, wherein the first and second contacts are coupled to each other via the capacitor only. As discussed in the response filed 7 March 2006, Thrush's capacitor 30 is not serially coupled between the power circuits of the DIP and the circuit board, or the ground circuits of the DIP and the circuit board.

Claims 2 – 12, 28 and 29 are patentable over Thrush at least by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1, as pending before the current amendment and as currently amended.

Rejection of Claims 13 – 22 over Thrush

Claim 13, as pending before the current amendment and as currently amended, is patentable over Thrush at least for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1 over Thrush.

Claims 14 – 22 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 13.

Conclusion

The applicant's attorney respectfully requests the examiner withdraw the rejection against claims 1 – 22 and 24 – 29 and issue an allowance for claims 1 – 22, 24 – 29 and 32 – 43, as amended.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicants' attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an Office Action, the examiner call Mr. David Plettner (408-447-3013) or Mr. John Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

DATED this 6th day of September 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP



John M. Janeway
Registration No. 45,796

Correspondence to:
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Phone: (408) 447-3013